

Plain Language Ballots

Clerk & Auditor Association of Utah



Utah
235 words

PROPOSITION NUMBER 2

Shall a law be enacted to:

- establish a state-controlled process that allows persons with certain illnesses to acquire and use medical cannabis and, in certain limited circumstances, to grow up to six cannabis plants for personal medical use;
- authorize the establishment of facilities that grow, process, test, or sell medical cannabis and require those facilities to be licensed by the state; and
- establish state controls on those licensed facilities, including:
 - electronic systems that track cannabis inventory and purchases; and
 - requirements and limitations on the packaging and advertising of cannabis and on the types of products allowed?

Initial Fiscal Impact Estimate:
The Governor's Office of Management and Budget estimates the law proposed by this initiative would result in total fiscal expenses of \$2,900,000 (\$1,800,000 ongoing and \$1,100,000 one-time).

Fee collections would cover about \$1,400,000 of ongoing costs. General state revenues would be required for remaining ongoing costs (\$400,000) and all one-time costs (\$1,100,000).

Under the proposed sales tax exemption, the state and local governments may initially forego \$1,600,000 in sales tax revenue. Foregone revenue could increase over time if consumption and taxable sales increase in the later years following implementation.

Consumer and firm behavior different than assumed would alter these estimates.

In addition, the cost of posting information regarding the initiative in Utah's statewide newspapers and for printing the additional pages in the voter information packet is estimated at \$30,000 in one-time funds.

☐ FOR ☐ AGAINST

Oregon
73 words

State Legislative Measures
Referred to the People by the
Legislative Assembly

**94 Amends Constitution:
Eliminates mandatory
retirement age for state
judges**

Result of "Yes" Vote: "Yes" amends constitution, state judges not required to retire from judicial office after turning 75 years old. Statutes cannot establish mandatory retirement age.

Result of "No" Vote: "No" vote retains constitutional provisions requiring state judges to retire from judicial office after turning 75 years old, authorizing statutes establishing lesser mandatory retirement age.

☐ Yes ☐ No

STATE MEASURES

2

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE. Amends Mental Health Services Act to fund No Place Like Home Program, which finances housing for individuals with mental illness. Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program. Fiscal Impact: Allows the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds. These bonds would fund housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

158

YES

☐

159

NO

☐

PROP 2

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

SUMMARY *Put on the Ballot by the Legislature*

Amends Mental Health Services Act to fund No Place Like Home Program, which finances housing for individuals with mental illness. Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program. Fiscal Impact: Allows the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds. These bonds would fund housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

WHAT YOUR VOTE MEANS

YES A YES vote on this measure means: The state could use existing county mental health funds to pay for housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

NO A NO vote on this measure means: The state's ability to use existing county mental health funds to pay for housing for those with mental illness who are homeless would depend on future court decisions.

ARGUMENTS

PRO YES on Prop. 2: Supportive housing and treatment for homeless people living with serious mental illness. Prop. 2 won't raise taxes. It will help people off the streets and into comprehensive mental health services and addiction treatment. Homeless advocates, social workers, doctors and emergency responders agree: Yes on Prop. 2.

CON Taking up to \$5.6 BILLION away from the severely mentally ill to fund bonds to build them just housing without requiring treatment will force many more into homelessness. It is unnecessary, because last year the Legislature authorized county use of MHSAs for housing without the need to borrow money.

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

FOR David Koenig (916) 974-9411 info@CAyesonprop2.org CAyesonprop2.org

AGAINST Gigi R. Crowder NAMI Contra Costa 550 Patterson Blvd. Pleasant Hill, CA (510) 990-2670 gigi@namicontracosta.org www.namicontracosta.org

2

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The text of this measure can be found on the Secretary of State's website at <http://voterguide.sos.ca.gov>.

- Ratifies existing law establishing the No Place Like Home Program, which finances permanent housing for individuals with mental illness who are homeless or at risk for chronic homelessness, as being consistent with the Mental Health Services Act approved by the electorate.
- Ratifies issuance of up to \$2 billion in previously authorized bonds to finance the No Place Like Home Program.
- Amends the Mental Health Services Act to authorize transfers of up to \$140 million annually from the existing Mental Health Services Fund to the No Place Like Home Program, with no increase in taxes.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S ESTIMATE OF NET STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL IMPACT:

- Allows the state to use up to \$140 million per year of county mental health funds to repay up to \$2 billion in bonds. These bonds would fund housing for those with mental illness who are homeless.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

BACKGROUND
Counties Provide Mental Health Services. Counties are primarily responsible for providing mental health care for persons who lack private coverage. Counties provide psychiatric treatment, counseling, hospitalization, and other mental health services. Some counties also arrange other types of help for those with mental illness—such as housing, substance abuse treatment, and employment services.

Mental Health Services Act. In 2004, California voters passed Proposition 63

also known as the Mental Health Services Act. The act provides funding for various county mental health services by increasing the income tax paid by those with income above \$1 million. This income tax increase raises \$1.5 billion to \$2.5 billion per year.

No Place Like Home Program. In 2016, the Legislature created the No Place Like Home Program to build and rehabilitate housing for those with mental illness who are homeless or at-risk of becoming homeless. The state plans to pay for this housing by borrowing up to \$2 billion

PROPOSITION 2

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 2 ★

YES on Prop. 2 delivers the proven solution to help the most vulnerable people experiencing homelessness in California. Prop. 2 builds housing and keeps mental health services in reach for people—the key to alleviating homelessness complicated by mental illness. More than 134,000 people are languishing on our streets, huddled on sidewalks, sleeping under freeways and along riverbanks. As many as a third of the people living in these unsafe conditions are living with an untreated mental illness. Each year, hundreds of people living with a serious mental illness die in pain and isolation. These deaths are preventable. Prop. 2 tackles this public health crisis that is straining our neighborhoods, our businesses, our firefighters and emergency services. It reinforces our sense of community and focuses on helping save the lives of the most vulnerable among us.

NO PLACE LIKE HOME

YES on Prop. 2 means building 20,000 permanent supportive housing units under the "No Place Like Home" Program. This allows coordinated care of mental health and substance use services, medical care, case managers, education and job training to help people get the treatment and housing stability they need. Decades of research shows providing people with a stable place to live along with mental health services promotes healthy, stable lives. This combination is known as permanent supportive housing. Studies show supportive housing significantly reduces public health costs and reduces blight.

STRENGTHENING PARTNERSHIPS TO HELP PEOPLE IN NEED

YES on Prop. 2 will help establish and strengthen partnerships between doctors, law enforcement, mental health and homeless service providers to help ensure care is coordinated and tailored to meet the needs of each person.

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 2 ★

would be a costly mistake and contribute to: Neglect and missing treatment resources, Causing more individuals with severe and persistent mental illness to lose housing and result in even more of them being incarcerated and living on the street. Through stakeholder engagement, counties already know where to find and acquire housing for access to critical services. Prop. 2 cuts off local input and predetermines the balance between treatment and housing needs.

Treatment prevents homelessness. Vote "No" on Proposition 2 to avoid a costly and inhumane mistake!

CHARLES MADSON, President
NAMI Contra Costa
GIGI R. CROWDER, L.E., Executive Director
NAMI Contra Costa
DOUGLAS W. DUNN, Chair
Legislative Committee, NAMI Contra Costa

CHIEF DAVID SWING, President
California Police Chiefs Association
DR. SERGIO AGUILAR-SAXOOLA, Former Member
National Advisory Mental Health Council of the National Institute of Mental Health

Family members, in partnership with faith communities, actually live the tragedies described by the proponents. We struggle to find treatment and housing supports for loved ones who are targeted by this Proposition. We support exploring well thought out housing options to end homelessness but Oppose Proposition 2 because it takes Billions away from our loved ones and rewards developers, bond-holders, and bureaucrats. As of 2017, a portion of Proposition 63 money, as determined by each county with community input, MUST fund supportive housing for those suffering severe mental illnesses. We OPPOSE cruel and senseless skimming up to \$5.6 Billion of sorely needed treatment funds for bonds (\$140 million yearly, for forty years) and giving \$100 Million to state housing bureaucrats who don't understand the challenges of those living with severe mental illness. The federal government threatens treatment funding cutbacks. Therefore, we cannot afford to affluce any MSHA funds to solve a problem better addressed at the county level. Reducing MSHA funds needed for treatment

would be a costly mistake and contribute to: Neglect and missing treatment resources, Causing more individuals with severe and persistent mental illness to lose housing and result in even more of them being incarcerated and living on the street. Through stakeholder engagement, counties already know where to find and acquire housing for access to critical services. Prop. 2 cuts off local input and predetermines the balance between treatment and housing needs.

Treatment prevents homelessness. Vote "No" on Proposition 2 to avoid a costly and inhumane mistake!

CHARLES MADSON, President
NAMI Contra Costa
GIGI R. CROWDER, L.E., Executive Director
NAMI Contra Costa
DOUGLAS W. DUNN, Chair
Legislative Committee, NAMI Contra Costa

AUTHORIZES BONDS TO FUND EXISTING HOUSING PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

2

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

CONTINUE

The state would borrow this money by selling bonds, which would be repaid with interest over about 30 years using revenues from the Mental Health Services Act. This means less funding would be available for other county mental health services. No more than \$140 million of Mental Health Services Act funds could be used for No Place Like Home in any year. The bond payments would be around \$120 million in a typical year.

Court Approval Needed for No Place Like Home. Before these bonds can be sold, the state must ask the courts to approve the state's plan to pay for No Place Like Home. The courts must decide two main issues:

- Whether using Mental Health Services Act dollars to pay for No Place Like Home goes along with what the voters wanted when they approved the Mental Health Services Act.
- Whether voters need to approve the No Place Like Home bonds. (The State Constitution requires voters to approve certain kinds of state borrowing.)

This court decision is pending.

PROPOSAL

The measure allows the state to carry out No Place Like Home. In particular, the measure:

- Approves the Use of Mental Health Services Act Funds for No Place Like Home. The measure says that Mental Health Services Act funds can be used for No Place Like Home. No more than \$140 million of Mental Health Services

Act funds could be used for No Place Like Home in any year.

- Authorizes \$2 Billion in Borrowing.** The measure allows the state to sell up to \$2 billion in bonds to pay for No Place Like Home. The bonds would be repaid over many years with Mental Health Services Act funds.

With this measure, the state would no longer need court approval on the issues discussed above to carry out No Place Like Home.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Fiscal Effect Depends on the Court Decision. The fiscal effect of the measure depends on whether or not the courts would have approved the state's plan to pay for No Place Like Home. If the courts would have approved the state's plan, the measure would have little effect. This is because the state would have gone forward with No Place Like Home in any case. If the courts would have rejected the state's plan, the state would not have been able to move forward with No Place Like Home. This measure would allow the state to do so.

Visit <http://www.sos.ca.gov/campaign-lobbying/cal-access-resources/measure-contributions/2018-ballot-measure-contribution-totals> for a list of committees primarily formed to support or oppose this measure. Visit <http://www.fppc.ca.gov/transparency/tp-contributors/show-18-gen.html> to access the committee's top 10 contributors.

If you desire a copy of the full text of the state measure, please call the Secretary of State at (800) 345-VOTE (8683) or you can email vgfeedback@sos.ca.gov and a copy will be mailed at no cost to you.

PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS. LEGISLATIVE STATUTE.

2

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 2 ★

Please vote "No" on the "No Place Like Home Act," which should have been called the "Bureaucrat and Developer Enrichment Act," because that is who we feel will most benefit at the expense of those suffering with the most severe mental illnesses.

NAMI Contra Costa members are mostly family members with "skin in the game," so therefore are strong advocates for people living with serious and persistent mental illnesses who oppose this bill. Particularly given ongoing federal cutbacks, NPLH is counterproductive because it spends billions in treatment funds that Voter Proposition 63 dedicated to the severely mentally ill fourteen years ago. If passed, we strongly feel NPLH will cause more homelessness by forcing more mentally ill people into severe symptoms that could increase the numbers living on the streets.

Proposition 2 is:

- Costly—up to \$5.6 Billion (\$140 million x 40, for 40-year bonds) to raise \$2 billion for housing projects. It won't all go to housing, because housing bureaucrats have already guaranteed themselves \$100 million (5% of the \$2 billion), admittedly far more than needed to run the program, and have also agreed between themselves to take the entire \$140 million yearly as "administrative expenses," whether or not they need that amount to pay off the bonds.
- Developer subsidies (low interest deferred loans that developers will use to build and purchase \$2 Billion in valuable California housing, plus up to 50% operating subsidies) effectively cost the public even more.
- Unnecessary, because the Legislature authorized counties to pay for housing for their severely mentally

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 2 ★

- 3,500 homeless people off the streets
- 96% of study participants stayed in program at least one year
- Taxpayers saved more than \$6.5 million in one year alone
- Participants visited the ER 70% less, saving healthcare costs and easing the burden on emergency responders

Learn more. Visit CAyesonProp2.org. Vote YES on Prop. 2; provide safe, secure supportive housing and services for the chronically homeless—proven to help people living with mental illness stay off the streets.

DR. AIMEE MOULIN, President
California Professional Firefighters
JANLEY WONG, MSW, Executive Director
National Association of Social Workers—California Chapter

20 | Arguments

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors, and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors, and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency

Arguments | 21

Plain Language Ballots

Clerk & Auditor Association of Utah

